



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,108	08/26/2003	Ankur Bhatt	13906-123001 / 2003P00283	3166
32864	7590	09/04/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ANTONIENKO, DEBRA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,108

Applicant(s)

BHATT ET AL.

Examiner

DEBRA ANTONIENKO

Art Unit

3689

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31 and 33-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31 and 33-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/14/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 July 2009 has been entered.

2. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to communications received 2 July 2009, wherein:

Claims 1-4, 9-13, 16-22, 27-31, and 34-37 have been amended;

Claims 5-8, 14, 23-26, and 32 have been cancelled; therefore,

Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15-22, 27-31, and 33-37 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3. Amendments to independent claims 1 and 18 are sufficient to overcome the 35 USC § 101 rejections to claims 1-18 and 36 set forth previously in the Office Action of 2 April 2009.

Response to Arguments

4. As to Applicant's argument that *the displays that Thompson discloses as being used to define content for inclusion in a report do not include the integrated presentation*

aspect of the method of claim 1 following receipt of a user selection of a business object, and do not provide, in a single view, access to at least some attributes of a selected business object as well as access to business objects related to the selected business object and access to at least some attributes of the related business objects, as recited in claim 1 (page 11 of Response dated 2 July 2009).

Thompson discloses the various business objects and attributes in a single view, in a single window in Figure 7. That is to say, when the tree is expanded, the business objects and respective attributes are in a single view. Thompson further discloses four windows with business objects and attributes in Figure 3. Also, the quick drill feature allows further views. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide four separate windows instead of the tree hierarchy of Figure 7. Also, Thompson discloses defined relationships in Figures 25A - 25J. Though the objects, attributes, and relationships are not presented or formatted in the exact same way, the functionality is the same, i.e., to select business objects and attributes to form a report. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the one view of the tree hierarchy showing the business objects and attributes or the one view with four windows. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Thompson to obtain the formatting as specified in claim 1.

Furthermore, Examiner notes that *it must be remembered that the "obviousness" test of § 103 is not one which turns on whether an invention is equivalent to some element in the prior art but rather whether the difference between the prior art and the subject matter in question "is a difference sufficient to render the claimed subject matter unobvious to one skilled in the applicable art * * *."* *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 189 USPQ 257 (1976). Examiner further notes that *the mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the invention's nonobviousness. The gap between the prior art and respondent's system is simply not so great as to render the system nonobvious to one reasonably skilled in the art. Ibid.* Thompson discloses business objects and attributes as well as defined relationships. Therefore, that Thompson's example does not state the exact same formatting does not effectively serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 15-19, 21, 22, 27-30, and 33-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,668,253 B1 (hereinafter Thompson).

Regarding **Claims 1 and 19**, Thompson teaches a computer-implemented method of providing object-based content to be reported in an external computer-implemented general reporting application, the method comprising: providing an electronic storage repository of business database objects from which object instances are able to be generated, which business database objects each have one or more attributes for which applicable data are able to be provided for a generated object instance (column 2, lines 24-60; column 20, lines 41-53; column 32, line 37- column 33, line 55; it is implicit with object-oriented programming that object instances are generated and that the objects have attributes); receiving, in a data processing system comprising at least one computer, a user selection of one of the business database objects, wherein generated instances of the selected object have data for attributes of the object (column 8, lines 15-22; Figures 5-7; selection of stock and then selection of max days, for example).

Thompson does not explicitly teach displaying on a display device a view that includes: i) the selected business database object in a first portion of the view, ii) at least some of the attributes associated with the selected business database object in a second portion of the view, iii) a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business database object in a third portion of the view, and iv) at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects in a fourth portion of the view.

However, Thompson teaches displaying on a display device selected business objects with attributes and associated business objects with attributes (column 7, lines 12-14;

Figures 3, 7, and 25I; items are selected from the component view to put into the layout view). Thompson discloses the various business objects and attributes in a single view, in a single window in Figure 7. That is to say, when the tree is expanded, the business objects and respective attributes are in a single view. Thompson further discloses four windows with business objects and attributes in Figure 3. Also, the quick drill feature allows further views. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide four separate windows instead of the tree hierarchy of Figure 7. Also, Thompson discloses defined relationships in Figures 25A - 25J. Though the objects, attributes, and relationships are not presented or formatted in the exact same way, the functionality is the same, i.e., to select business objects and attributes to form a report. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the one view of the tree hierarchy showing the business objects and attributes or the one view with four windows. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Thompson to obtain the formatting as specified in claim 1.

Furthermore, Examiner notes that *it must be remembered that the "obviousness" test of § 103 is not one which turns on whether an invention is equivalent to some element in the prior art but rather whether the difference between the prior art and the subject matter in question "is a difference sufficient to render the claimed subject matter unobvious to one skilled in the applicable art * * *."* *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219,

189 USPQ 257 (1976). Examiner further notes that *the mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the invention's nonobviousness. The gap between the prior art and respondent's system is simply not so great as to render the system nonobvious to one reasonably skilled in the art.* Ibid. Thompson discloses business objects and attributes as well as defined relationships. Therefore, that Thompson's example does not state the exact same formatting does not effectively serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

Thompson further discloses receiving in the data processing system a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business database object, and a user selection of at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects, and adding the selected attributes to an electronic business content structure of selected attributes (column 8, lines 29-35 and 53-61; Figure 7); executing a query of records in an electronic database and retrieving, for each of the records that meet the query, attribute data for each of the attributes in the electronic business content structure (column 14, lines 9-19); and generating in the data processing system an output electronic file that the external computer-implemented reporting application can use to generate a report, the report to include the electronic business content structure and the attribute data associated therewith (Figures 12-14).

Regarding **Claim 18**, Thompson teaches a computer-implemented method of providing object-based content to be reported in an external computer-implemented_general reporting application, the method comprising: receiving, in a data processing system comprising at least one computer, a user selection of a business database object having associated attributes, wherein generated instances of the selected object have data for the associated attributes (column 8, lines 15-22; Figures 5-7).

Thompson does not explicitly teach displaying on a display device a view that includes: i) the selected business database object in a first portion of the view, ii) at least some of the attributes associated with the selected business database object in a second portion of the view, iii) a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business database object in a third portion of the view, and iv) at least some of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects in a fourth portion of the view.

However, Thompson teaches displaying on a display device selected business objects with attributes and associated business objects with attributes (column 7, lines 12-14; Figures 3, 7, and 25); items are selected from the component view to put into the layout view). Thompson discloses the various business objects and attributes in a single view, in a single window in Figure 7. That is to say, when the tree is expanded, the business objects and respective attributes are in a single view. Thompson further discloses four windows with business objects and attributes in Figure 3. Also, the quick drill feature

allows further views. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide four separate windows instead of the tree hierarchy of Figure 7. Also, Thompson discloses defined relationships in Figures 25A - 25J. Though the objects, attributes, and relationships are not presented or formatted in the exact same way, the functionality is the same, i.e., to select business objects and attributes to form a report. In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the one view of the tree hierarchy showing the business objects and attributes or the one view with four windows. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Thompson to obtain the formatting as specified in claim 1.

Furthermore, Examiner notes that *it must be remembered that the "obviousness" test of § 103 is not one which turns on whether an invention is equivalent to some element in the prior art but rather whether the difference between the prior art and the subject matter in question "is a difference sufficient to render the claimed subject matter unobvious to one skilled in the applicable art * * *."* *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 189 USPQ 257 (1976). Examiner further notes that *the mere existence of differences between the prior art and an invention does not establish the invention's nonobviousness. The gap between the prior art and respondent's system is simply not so great as to render the system nonobvious to one reasonably skilled in the art. Ibid.* Thompson discloses business objects and attributes as well as defined relationships.

Therefore, that Thompson's example does not state the exact same formatting does not effectively serve to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art.

Thompson further discloses receiving in the data processing system a user selection of at least one of the displayed one or more attributes associated with the selected business database object, and a user selection of at least one of the displayed attributes for the plurality of related business objects, and adding the selected attributes to an electronic business content structure of selected attributes (column 8, lines 29-35 and 53-61; Figure 7); and persistently storing the electronic business content structure in an electronic database so that it can later be retrieved and used to generate an output file that the external computer-implemented general reporting application can use to generate a report with current data (column 4, lines 56-59).

Regarding Claims 3, 10, 21, and 28, respectively, Thompson further teaches wherein the electronic business content structure represents meta-data information (column 32, line 37 – column 33, lines 55).

Regarding Claims 4 and 22, Thompson further teaches displaying on the display device a view of a plurality of electronic business content structures and receiving a user selection of one of the electronic business content structures to be included in a report (column 8, lines 29-35; Figure 6).

Regarding Claims 9 and 27, Thompson further teaches defining a calculated field to be included in the electronic business content structure, wherein the calculated field is associated with a function that takes one or more business object attributes as input, and uses a formula to compute a resultant value for the calculated field based on the input (column 7, lines 47-54; column 9, lines 34-44; subtotals).

Regarding Claims 11 and 29, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein the resultant value is included in the electronic output file. However, Thompson teaches calculation capabilities, subtotals (see Claims 9 and 27), as well as the capability to consolidate financial information. Also, Thompson discloses the use of third party product for use in reporting (column 30, lines 30-41; Figure 4; the subtotals or resultant values would be in the output file so that they can be used in the external reporting application).

Regarding Claims 12 and 30, Thompson further teaches persistently storing the electronic business content structure in an electronic database (column 4, lines 56-59).

Regarding Claims 15 and 33, Thompson further teaches wherein the database query is an SQL query that uses the concept of derived tables (column 14, lines 9-19).

Regarding Claims 16 and 34, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein the electronic output file is an ActiveX Data Object Recordset. However, Thompson discloses the

invention operates on browsers with support for ActiveX controls (column 30, lines 49-54).

Regarding Claims 17 and 35, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein generating the electronic output file that the external computer-implemented reporting application can use to generate the report further comprises transferring the output electronic file to a reporting-tool-specific interface component capable of plug-and-play interaction with the external computer-implemented reporting application. However, Thompson discloses the use of MicroStrategy™ DSS Web (column 12, lines 45-59) which is known to employ plug-n-play components.

Regarding Claims 36 and 37, Thompson further teaches displaying a pictorial representation of the selected business database object and one or more of the related business objects (Figures 5 and 7).

7. **Claims 2 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of SAMS Teach Yourself Microsoft Access 2000 (hereinafter referred to as Access).

Regarding Claims 2 and 20, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein a business content design wizard assists in defining the electronic business content structure. However, Access discloses creating databases and tables with a wizard (pages 201-214). Wizards are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Thompson invention to incorporate wizards in order to provide an efficient and user-friendly way to create databases and tables.

8. **Claims 13 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Bata et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,901,403 B1 (hereinafter referred to as Bata).

Regarding Claims 13 and 31, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein the electronic business content structure is stored as an XML document in the electronic database, and wherein the electronic business content structure attributes correspond to tags in the XML document. However, Bata teaches the use of XML in the representation of data (Figure 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Thompson to incorporate XML into the invention as the XML format is well known for being conducive to capturing the structure of data for network functionality.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBRA ANTONIENKO whose telephone number is (571)270-3601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on 571-272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DA

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689